DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 102 HE 008 581

AUTHOR Burn, Barbara B.
TITLE Reflections on an International Seminar. Higher Education in a Changing World. Conference Report No. 3.
INSTITUTION International Council for Educational Development, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *College Role; Conferences; *Cultural Context; Demography; *Economic Climate; *Educational Economics; Educational Planning; Equal Education; General Education; Government Role; *Higher Education; Humanistic Education; *International Educational Exchange; International Organizations; Liberal Arts; School Community Relationship; Student Characteristics; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies

ABSTRACT

This commentary is based on an International Council for Educational Development (ICED) seminar held in conjunction with the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies at Aspen, Colorado, in July 1975. Some of the broader issues raised there are explored: economic dilemmas, interdependency of world economy, forces of continued higher education expansion and flexibility, demographic trends, pressures for equality. and other higher education problems. Other areas covered include the diversification of students and their needs, the professoriate, and administrators; changing aims and management regarding recurrent education, liberal education, career training, higher education planning, the power of administrators, bureaucratic impact, size of institutions, and erosion of "community." A consensus examined is that at least some universities should stand apart from society rather than being a part of it, in the sense of responding to regional, national or even international needs if they were determined from without. (LBH)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

Library
National Center for Higher Education

ED134102

## Reflections on an International Seminar

# HIGHER EDUCATION IN A CHANGING WORLD

A report based on the 1975 Aspen Seminar held under the joint sponsorship of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies and the International Council for Educational Development.

**Barbara B. Burn**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008581

IC ED International Council for Educational Development

Conference Report Number Three

International Council for Educational Development
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019 USA

Copyright © by International Council for Educational Development
Library of Congress Catalog No. 76-4452
Printed in U.S.A. March 1976
by the Van Dyck Printing Company, North Haven, Connecticut 06473

# FOREWORD

Barbara Burn has written an exceptionally interesting report. Based on an ICED seminar held in conjunction with the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies at Aspen, Colorado in July of 1975, she has properly used the seminar as a stimulant rather than as a boundary for her writing.

The seminar papers have already been published, as edited by Mrs. Burn, in the ICED Conference Paper *Higher Education and the Current Crises.* She was encouraged to write her own commentary in the hope that she would be forced by this discipline to put her own considerable knowledge about higher education into a systematic presentation. The idea turned out to be better than we knew.

Barbara Burn is Director of International Programs at the University of Massachusetts. In recent years she has become interested in the international dimensions of higher education. She is the author of *Higher Education in Nine Countries,* written for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, and *The Emerging System of Higher Education in Italy,* a report of an ICED seminar with prominent Italian educators. Mrs. Burn is one of our most literate observers of higher education. ICED is pleased to have sponsored this report.

James A. Perkins, Chairman
International Council for
Educational Development

# ASPEN SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

July 1975

James A. Perkins, *Chairman of the International Council for Educational Development*

Barbara B. Burn, *Rapporteur, Director of International Programs, University of Massachusetts*

Alain Bienaymé, *Chargé de Mission au Cabinet du President de l'Assemblée Nationale, Paris, France*

Howard R. Bowen, *R. Stanton Avery Professor of Economics and Education, Claremont Graduate School, California*

Nell Eurich, *Vice President for Academic Affairs, Manhattanville College, New York*

Luis Garibay, *Rector, Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico*

Dietrich Goldschmidt, *Director, Max-Planck Institute for Educational Research, Berlin, Federal Republic of Germany*

Mrs. Karl G. Hasemann, *Hoffnungsthal, Federal Republic of Germany*

The Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, *President, University of Notre Dame, Indiana*

Torsten Husén, *Professor of Education and Director, Institute for the Study of International Problems in Education, University of Stockholm, Sweden*

Alexander A. Kwapong, *Vice-Rector (effective January 1, 1976) United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan*

Raymond-François Le Bris, *Le Directeur du Cabinet, Secrétariat d'Etat aux Universités, Paris, France*

John W. Nason, *former President, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, and Carleton College, Minnesota*

David S. Perkins, *Assistant, Student, Yale University*

David Z. Robinson, *Vice President, Carnegie Corporation of New York*

John Vaizey, *Professor of Economics, School of Social Sciences, Brunel University, Middlesex, England*

# HIGHER EDUCATION IN A CHANGING WORLD

Claude Bissell, president of the University of Toronto from 1958-71, in reflecting on changes at that university during what he called "the revolution between 1968 and 1971" observed that:

> It lost its protected position in society. . . . The university was now, in a sense, on its own. Autonomy was no longer a grace automatically bestowed; it had to be won in the dust and heat of the arena. . . . Within, dissident elements must be reconciled, and a strong, rational centre created to speak for the whole; outside the university must greatly expand and intensify its program of explanation, and work out more direct, specific means of relating scholarship to social action.[1]

The changing world confronting higher education and the changes in higher education, itself, some of which are encapsulated in Bissell's remarks were the focus of the third ICED international seminar, held at the Aspen Institute in July 1975. The seminar took as its jumping off point recent and projected changes, evolutionary as well as revolutionary, in the international and national societies of which higher education systems are a part. What have been and will be the major changes in the economic situation, in social and

[1] Claude Bissell, *Halfway up Parnassus: A Personal Account of the University of Toronto 1932-1971*, Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press, 1974, p. 191.

demographic trends, in the philosophical and psychological climate, and in the international arena? Whereas the individual papers given at the seminar and published by ICED[2] present the main points on these topics, this extended essay attempts to capture and reflect on some of the broader issues raised in the lively seminar discussions, and to weave them together for whatever insights they may offer on the future directions of higher education institutions and systems.

The seminar mood was hardly one of optimism. Among the preseminar readings recommended to participants by the chairman was Robert L. Heilbroner's *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect*. While seminar participants may not have shared fully his "awareness of an oppressive anticipation of the future,"[3] the discussions during the first week of the seminar on the changing world society, to quote Heilbroner again, "added their freight of disquiet and disconcert to the mood."[4]

## Economic Dilemmas

Taking the economic situation first, the Western industrialized nations have since 1973 been experiencing a major crisis with inflation, stagflation, economic recession, and rising unemployment. Alain Bienaymé predicted a long period of much slower economic growth (probably no more than 2% in Western Europe in 1976) and continuing problems of unemployment. Graduate unemployment has sharply increased and will probably continue to do so. For example, the percentage of university graduates still seeking

---

[2] *Higher Education and the Current Crises*, Barbara B. Burn, editor, New York: International Council for Educational Development (ICED), 1975.

[3] Robert L. Heilbroner, *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1974, p. 14.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

employment a year after graduation rose from 1.5% in 1965 to 7.8% in 1971, and is still higher today. In the Federal Republic of Germany (hereafter referred to as Germany) the number of unemployed 15-20 year olds increased 230% between September 1973 and September 1974,[5] and serious graduate unemployment is imminent with a forecast of well over 10,000 new graduate teachers unable to find jobs in 1976.[6]

As increasing numbers of persons in the industrialized countries want to work, especially women and those with more education, unemployment problems will worsen. At the same time, with increasing higher education enrollments, the differential between earnings of secondary school graduates and graduates of colleges and universities is expected to diminish. This will contribute to the current disenchantment with higher education and perhaps to the slowing down of rates of enrollment. In the United States college graduates now earn on the average only 40% more than high school graduates. As Howard Bowen pointed out, 1970 marked a turning point in that since that year the differential between earnings of these two groups has been diminishing rather than increasing.

The year 1970 also marked a turning point with respect to higher education finance. During the 1960s member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) increased expenditures on higher education at a rate three times that of the Gross National Product, and enrollments doubled or tripled in the same period. With the ushering in of the 1970s there was a widespread realization that such a rapidly rising level of investment can no longer be afforded. Also, as Alain

[5] David Dungworth, "Sharp Increase in Young People out of Work," *The Times Educational Supplement*, March 28, 1975.

[6] David Dungworth, "Big Cutbacks on the Way despite Bonn Reflation," *The Times Educational Supplement*, September 19, 1975.

Bienaymé remarked, the assumption that higher education contributes importantly to economic growth by expanding human capital has been increasingly questioned in the last few years. Moreover, economic growth itself is questioned, especially since the publication of the Club of Rome's *Limits to Growth* which was indicative of what people were beginning to ask. There is a widening awareness of the limits to economic growth and serious doubt that it is any longer a sufficient or appropriate goal for national policy.

As Alexander Kwapong of Ghana, now vice rector for planning and development of the United Nations University, emphatically pointed out, the situation is quite the opposite for the developing nations. Setting limits to growth is a luxury that the developed world can afford and the developing cannot. The year 1973 was a turning point in their economic situation. While the quadrupling of oil prices in that year by the 13 member nations of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) contributed to inflation and recession in the industrialized countries, the consequences of higher oil prices and the worldwide recession on the nonoil producing third world countries have been devastating. The cost of their essential imports has risen (40% in 1973 alone), and recession has significantly reduced their industrial markets abroad. They cannot absorb the oil price increases by raising their export prices as these mainly involve primary products, the pricing of which is subject to the vagaries of worldwide supply and demand. The efforts of developing countries to secure stable and adequate prices for their raw material exports, such as bauxite, tin, sugar, and jute, pursued now through commissions set up by the December 1975 Conference on International Economic Cooperation, have so far not provided the developing countries with the solutions they seek.

**Interdependency of World Economy**

It is ironic that these countries, having achieved political independence, now see economic independence as a remote

and elusive prospect. Political decolonization is an empty achievement without economic decolonization. In the view of the developing countries this requires a new international economic order with a more equitable distribution of wealth between rich and poor nations. Otherwise the rich will continue to grow richer and the poor poorer, as was the case from 1960 to 1974 when output per capita in the poorest nations saw little change, but went up from $2,768 to $4,550 in the industrialized world.[7]

The economic situation in both the developed and developing worlds points up the interdependency of the world economy. Thus, as Alain Bienaymé observed at Aspen, a major cause of the dramatic inflation in the West since 1973 was that fact that for the first time in 20 years the economies of North America, Western Europe, and Japan were expanding rapidly at the same time. Because these economies closely interlock, inflation was infectious and mutually reenforcing. In a similar vein recent analyses of the plight of the developing countries have argued that it is to be attributed not to:

> Such factors as traditional forms of social organization, 'inappropriate' value systems, inadequate educational systems, poorly developed administrative apparatus or the lack of economic planning,. . . (but) that many of the features that have been taken to characterize underdevelopment are either produced by, or closely linked to, the ways in which underdeveloped countries have been incorporated into the capitalist system (and for some countries into the socialist system).[8]

The implications of international interdependence for higher education are complex. In the short run it may reenforce nationalistic tendencies, especially in the

---

[7] Ann Crittenden, "World Bank Finds Poor Lands Poorer," *The New York Times*, December 21, 1975.

[8] Bryan R. Roberts, "Rethinking Development," *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, June 13, 1975.

developing countries, as they strive to have their own centers of excellence in the international arena, to withstand the brain drain of talent toward the industrialized nations, and, most important, to give priority to national needs in setting goals and policies for higher education development—and in doing so possibly to neglect the international role of universities in the objective advancement of teaching, scholarship, and service.

The quandary here is real and immediate. The August 1975 meeting of the International Association of Universities, at which representatives of universities from the developing and developed worlds apparently identified themselves and their aims in these terms, underscored their different orientations. It made clear the difficulty of achieving genuinely cooperative and equal relationships between universities in the developing and developed worlds and a possible need to establish a new order in the international higher education establishment which would parallel the new international economic order now demanded by the developing countries.

The Aspen seminar discussions on the domestic implications of the current economic crisis centered on the evolution of a new higher education order in the developed countries. Less support for higher education by governments and the public implies a larger burden in the future on students in bearing the costs of their higher education, as is already the case in the United States and the Netherlands. The shift from graduate student grants to loans in Germany and the concern in Ontario, Canada, that the percentage of universities' operating income derived from student tuition fees dropped from 28% to 18% between 1966-67 and 1974-75[9] are only two examples.

[9]Nancy Sullivan, "Ontario Report Says Students Should Pay More," *University Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 1, January 1976, p. 10.

The deteriorating employment situation for graduates is already having its impact in lower enrollment rates in Canada, Sweden, and France. The slowing of enrollment increases will be and already is reflected in decreased opportunities for faculty mobility and promotion. Linked with this development is a shift from a partnership relationship between faculty and administration to a situation of confrontation between them, and between higher education institutions and systems and government. At the system level more priority will be given to cheaper kinds of higher education in terms of fields, facilities, and institutions, and to more national planning and systems coordination at the expense of institutional autonomy. These tendencies are already underway.

Accompanying these tendencies are some paradoxes. At a time when leadership from the universities is urgently needed, they may be receiving less priority than the "less noble" higher education institutions such as the community colleges in the United States and polytechnics in Britain. Although it is more important than ever for faculty to have close relations with students, professors are under increasing pressure to do the research and publishing which draw them away from student contact. Finally, as James Perkins noted, although planning in higher education was never more needed, never has it been in such low estate.

## Optimistic Trends

To put these somewhat gloomy observations in perspective, the forces making for continued higher education expansion and flexibility should be noted. In 1973 only 12% of the U.S. population had a college degree, only 4% in the United Kingdom. The generation gap in higher education in Sweden—less than 10% of 35-44 year olds as of the 1970 census had entered higher education—is a major stimulus for the dramatic plans for recurrent education in that country to

see to it that by the year 2000 some 25% of the population will have been to college or university. In short, while the parlous contemporary economic situation may blight higher education's prospects, in fact the need for more is clear and admitted, if reluctantly, in some quarters.

**Demographic Trends and Higher Education**

John Vaizey and Torsten Husén reviewed various social and demographic factors operating in the international community and their implications for higher education's future. As Vaizey emphasized, a rising nationalism and drift toward autarky are major current trends. The international migrations which have taken place in the last several years pale earlier population movements. They are having their effects in intensifying ethnic movements and loyalties, in the deracination of large population groups from their home countries, and in the growing cultural diversity and pluralism within countries. Nor is the diversity a temporary phenomenon. For example, ten years ago less than a quarter of Britain's nonwhite population had been born in Britain; in the near future most of this group will have been. The nonwhites now constitute 2.5% of the British population. The notion of a common and cohesive value system underpinning a given society and the higher education system in it is becoming increasingly illusory. The notion of an education system founded on liberal values which assumed that racial and economic discrimination would lessen, that racial minorities would be absorbed into the main stream, and that class differences would be reduced, have proven unrealistic. In this situation, as John Vaizey noted, the urgent question is how long social democracy can last.

Another important demographic trend affecting higher education is the dramatic decline in the birthrate in the industrialized countries during the last decade. This will be reflected in a corresponding decline in the college and

university age cohort in the 1980s and 1990s. In Canada, for example, it is now projected that the 18-24 year old age group, currently a little over 3 million, will probably drop sharply as of 1982, down to about 2.6 million in 1992. If the current student-teacher ratio of 12/1 is maintained in the schools through the 1980s, there will be a teacher "surplus" in 1992 of 12,500 teachers.[10]

Accompanying the decline in the college age cohort will be a parallel relative increase in the middle-aged and older population with a corresponding increased pressure for more spending on social security, health, and human services generally. These pressures in a period of slower economic growth and slow or no growth in higher education enrollments (unless this is counterbalanced by expanded enrollments of older students) are likely seriously to diminish the resources available to higher education.

The expansion of higher education enrollments in the last decade or two in the industrialized nations has brought greater diversity in the socioeconomic background of students, although the representation of the lower quartile in higher education falls far short of the proportion they constitute of the population. For example, although higher education enrollments in the Netherlands more than tripled between 1958 and 1971, only 14% of all students are from the lower social strata which make up 54% of the total population. By contrast 36% and 50% of students come from the higher and middle strata respectively, and these constitute only 7% and 39% of the national population.[11]

---

[10] Lynda Woodcock, "Universities Must Prepare for Enrollment Fluctuations," *University Affairs*, Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), Vol. 16, No. 9, November 1975, p. 6.

[11] The Ministry of Education and Science, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, *Education and Science*, Vol. 7, 1973-74, pp. 27, 10.

## Pressures for Equality

The expanded diversity of student background, albeit limited, has stimulated egalitarian pressures for more effective equal opportunity for access. A variety of new institutions and arrangements to offer higher education to older students and persons who lack traditional university entrance qualifications have been launched. Among them are the 25/4 admissions system in Sweden (25 years of age, 4 years of work experience); the Open University in Britain; the University of Vincennes, Paris; the University of New South Wales in Australia; Athabasca University in Alberta, Canada; and Empire State College (New York); and the City University of New York, to mention only a few.

The egalitarian pressures motivating these experimental ventures in open or widened access have yet to come to terms with the essentially meritocratic nature of higher, especially university, education. Industrialized societies and their higher education systems are meritocratic in seeking out and selecting talent, in differentiating between talent, and in the process widening disparities between persons rather than leveling them. The dilemma of "Can one be a great social leveler and a selector at the same time?"[12] must be faced. Some advocates of egalitarianism confuse equality of opportunity with equality of outcome, although the university cannot grant equal certification to unequal talents without vitiating its essential purpose of sorting, educating, and certifying the more talented. The implications of the inherent conflict between egalitarianism and meritocracy for the diversification of higher education systems—in terms of aims, access, standards, and systems coordination—are discussed later. With regard to social and demographic trends the main point is that in pointing toward greater egalitarian

[12] George W. Bonham, "Back to First Principles," *Change*, Vol. 7, No. 8, October 1975, p. 11.

pressures, they may fuel attacks on the university as an elitist institution.

The allegedly elitist nature of universities is under attack in both the developing and the developed world. In the former disenchantment with the contribution of higher education is acute. Modelled on universities of the colonial powers at a time when they were elitist, universities in the developing world are perceived as failing to solve basic problems in these countries. They are accused, moreover, of warping secondary education so that rather than producing a work force capable of contributing to national development, it merely grooms or serves as a pipeline for university entrance, imparting few if any useful skills to those failing to gain entry to university. It is hardly surprising in this context that a country like Tanzania has now adopted a policy not to admit university applicants directly from school, but requires several years of work experience. This then is evaluated in part on the basis of commitment to national service in admissions decisions.[13] Traditional liberal education is discredited; vocational and technical education have more priority. But the inadequacies of educational planning (and of statistics for such planning) offer few clear guidelines for alternative policies on what higher education should do, for whom and how many, in what fields, and to what level. Nor does the experience of the socialist nations adequately illuminate these problems.

## Other Higher Education Problems

Another kind of disenchantment with higher education, as pointed out by John Nason, afflicts the developed nations, more particularly the United States. Higher education's product is questioned in terms of contribution to society, students finding "appropriate" jobs, the relative earnings of

[13] "University Education Is Actually Adult Education," *A.C.U. Bulletin of Current Documentation*, The Association of Commonwealth Universities, Number 21, December 1975, pp. 2, 4-5.

university vs. high school graduates, and the possible inconsistency of values associated with academia and those called for in complex industrialized societies. Nason reviewed a series of philosophical and psychological issues: the decline in respect for authority but an increased authoritarianism in society and in higher education; the decline in the belief in rationalism in problem identification and solving; an erosion of the work ethic paralleled by the emergence of a new Puritanism; an increasing realization of the self-destructiveness of modern technology and disenchantment with the university, its handmaiden; and an ebbing faith in democracy as a system of government which can cope with or respond to the needs of the postindustrial age. As Heilbroner suggested, the democratic process where it survives may have to give way to technocratic decision making.

The implications for democracy of a much slower rate of economic growth than in the past are also bleak. Peter Jenkins questions how much inflation and unemployment can be tolerated in a democracy without destroying it. He further comments that:

> It remains to be seen whether democracy can thrive or even survive without the rates of growth to which we have been accustomed for a quarter of a century and which it is most improbable the Western economies can achieve again for at least the next decade.[14]

As the Aspen seminar participants agreed, future trends in the international society cannot be predicted with any measure of certainty. The record of demographic and economic forecasting is littered with error. Nevertheless the seminarists ventured to speculate on future trends in demographic and social developments, in the international

[14] Peter Jenkins, "The Indian Summer of Democracy," *The Guardian*, September 20, 1975.

scene, and in the future economic order. They focused especially on the likely implications for higher education of their predictions. It is to these implications that these reflections on the Aspen seminar now turn.

# THE CHANGING CAST OF CHARACTERS

In her perceptive reflections on the discussion of access to higher education at the first ICED Aspen seminar, held in 1973, Barbara Baird Israel remarked on pressures to redefine access criteria. Mainly these were to admit more and different kinds of people to higher education on the theory that "by educating more and more people a society increases its supply of talent and competence; by limiting access to education, it decreases the supply and simultaneously perpetuates social inequities."[15] She also admitted that this concept hardly provides clear guidelines on admissions criteria to societies "not economically prepared to educate everyone."[16]

### Diversification of Students/Needs

The deteriorating economic situation worldwide since 1973 has made the matter of guidelines for admissions criteria—and an examination of the aims and functions of higher education yet more urgent today. The dramatic higher education expansion of the 1960s, as John Vaizey pointed out at the Aspen seminar, could only be a temporary phenomenon. Choices must be made on entry qualifications, aims, and presumed outcomes. Few if any societies can afford the exorbitant cost of meeting the total social demand for higher education.

---

[15] Barbara Baird Israel, *Reflections on an International Seminar, Can Higher Education Recapture Public Support?*, New York: ICED, 1974, p. 3.

[16] *Ibid.*, p.3.

The changes in the kinds of students seeking higher education several years ago were well documented by Mrs. Israel, along with the likely consequences of these changes for curricula, the professoriate, and structures. However, her reflections on higher education were set down some two years ago, before the major economic recession of the last several years had gained momentum. Changes in enrollments and their implications for the future directions of higher education now require institutions and systems to identify their priorities with more ruthlessness and accountability than when she wrote. The declining employment situation since then—including employment for graduates and faculty—make these decisions more difficult and more urgent.

The increased diversification of students has increased pressures for further diversification with the accompanying and often costly changes in higher education services and programs such diversity requires, but at a time of tightening resources. Basic questions of aims and values are increasingly questioned. With the link between higher education and employment becoming more diffuse—because of the trend toward mass higher education, the economic slow down, diminishing income advantages for graduates, and other factors—should students and higher education institutions focus more on vocational goals or the private rewards of higher education? Do faculty and institutions enhance their survival prospects by responding to the new nontraditional students and offering more "useful knowledge," or by reaffirming traditional scholarly values? Can universities become more invigorated and relevant by expanding their clienteles (and possibly their enrollments in the process), or does this threaten their essential mission of advanced teaching and scholarship?

When the 1973 Aspen seminar reflected on some of these questions, higher education systems may have had more

discretion than now in determining their answers. Changing directions in the aims, constituencies, and structures of higher education may now call for more rigor, and one hopes, more compassion. The impact of these changes on the cast of characters in higher education—students, faculty, and administrators within and without the institutions—is the focus of this chapter.

## Today's Students

First as to students. What are they like today and what will they be like a decade or so hence? In the industrialized countries students are on the average older than 10 or 15 years ago, and their average age is expected to rise. Some 48% of students in the United States are now over 22 years old, and at the University of Stockholm one fourth of the students are over 25. At universities in Australia, in 1973, 36.3% of the students were 23 and over.[17] In France as the University of Vincennes entrance model is generalized to other universities, offering admission to students lacking the baccalaureat but who have had at least three years of work experience (military service and motherhood are counted in this definition), and pass special ability tests and an interview, an older student body is the likely result. To achieve a more cohesive society and narrow the age gap in Sweden between the under and over 30 year olds who respectively have had 11-17 and 6 - 7 years of full-time education, priority is now given to admitting adults. A policy known an "total dimensioneering" reserves a proportion of places in higher education to these older students.

Although, as pointed out earlier, the percentage of students in higher education from lower socioeconomic strata

[17] *Open Tertiary Education*, Draft Report of the Committee on Open University to the Australian Universities Commission, April 1974, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1974, p. 22.

lags far behind the proportion these strata constitute of the total populations in the industrialized countries, significant advance has occurred. In Sweden the percentage of such students rose from 6% to 22% from 1950 to 1968. Female enrollments have also increased–to 37% of all students in Sweden in 1973. In Canada the percentage of women 14 years and older with some postsecondary education, only 5.7% in 1951, is projected at 27.3% in 1985. The equivalent figures for men are 8.5% and 36%.[18]

Generalizations on the implications of changes in the age, socioeconomic background, and sex of college and university students are hazardous. However, the 1975 Aspen seminar participants identified certain characteristics, the applicability of which of course varies from country to country. First, as a Nuffield Foundation study remarked (on British students only), "A common background and a common attitude to scholarship can no longer be assumed."[19] Moreover, students tend to be more vocationally or professionally oriented. They are far less activist politically than a few years ago; they are concentrating on their professional preparation, not on reforming institutions along or in their way. In typifying today's students Dietrich Goldschmidt used the phrase, "aspiration, desperation, resignation." A Canadian observer in commenting on students in that country stated that "The majority of students have found that studies must come first, social life comes second and attending committees comes a long way third."[20] They are more inner directed, preoccupied with private values instead of public concerns,

[18] Woodcock, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[19] The Nuffield Foundation, *The Drift of Change, An Interim Report of the Group for Research and Innovation in Higher Education*, London: The Times Books, 1975, p. 32.

[20] S.B. Frost, "Changing in University Administration, Fact and Consequences," *University Affairs*, Ottawa: AUCC, Vol. 17, No. 1, January 1976, p. 14.

coping or competing as members of complex technological societies.[21]

If higher education institutions so diversify their functions as to cater to increasingly diversified student bodies, how can admissions criteria appropriate to this situation be determined. The notion of "more means worse" or "limited pool of ability" has largely been discredited. Howard Bowen pointed out at Aspen that even with the great increases in higher education enrollments in the United States from 1920-1965, average ability rose, and the coming 25-30 years could bring 75% of the population to college admissions level. He expressed the conviction that there is more talent in society than has ever been realized. It is hardly surprising that the question, who is educable? did not get answered at Aspen.

U.S. experience with special programs in higher education for the disadvantaged has so far provided no guidelines for determining which disadvantaged students will be successful academically and what if any special services are needed to help them succeed. Experience shows, however, that special services set up for the disadvantaged meet important needs of more conventional students.[22]

## The Professoriate

For the professoriate the year 1970 was also something of a turning point. Barbara Israel in remarking on the 1973 Aspen seminar wrote that "it is the professoriate that has experienced the most wrenching changes."[23] These changes she

[21] Two seminar participants presented particularly thoughtful papers on these and related points, John W. Nason and David S. Perkins.

[22] Edmund W. Gordon, *Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education*, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1975, p. 18.

[23] Israel, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

attributed to an increase in younger staff, changing curricula and teaching methods, the effects of specialization, and new governance systems. As with access and the composition of student populations, more changes have occurred since the 1973 seminar, and some call for new interpretations of recent and projected trends. These trends can be summarized as isolation and fragmentation, diminished power, and confusion of function.

The isolation and fragmentation of the professoriate stems in part from the sheer growth in its numbers which paralleled enrollment expansion, like its tripling or quadrupling since the early 1960s and recruiting persons more diversified in their socioeconomic background and values. The community of scholars, whether within individual institutions or linking scholars in individual disciplines nationally (and internationally) has eroded from the weight of numbers, from a kind of generation gap between teaching staff socialized into academia in the elitist pre-1960s period and during that massive expansion, and from an increased differentiation in career patterns in higher education teaching. This differentiation has taken the form of different status, teaching duties and career prospects for new categories of teachers as at the German universities,[24] or for teaching staff at the still relatively new nonuniversity higher education institutions, although some observers assert that in the case of Great Britain, as a result of recent salary increases, polytechnic faculty have a higher, not lower, status than faculty at the universities.

As John Vaizey noted at Aspen, academic diversification and accompanying isolation and fragmentation have resulted from the rupture of the historically close link between

[24] Several years ago in some *Länder* a new category of professor, "H3," was established; they have larger teaching loads and only one instead of two or more assistants in contrast to the traditional "H4" professors.

academic secondary schools and universities in Britain and various continental European countries, including France and Germany. He noted that they had:

> a common mission in humanistic and mathematical culture. While it was true that the university teachers were the senior partners in this enterprise (as it were, they were the bishops while the school teachers were the priests), they nevertheless were both part of a common team. And there was a considerable movement of staff between the upper secondary schools and the university.[25]

Although this link is not dead, it is far more attenuated than when higher education was more elitist and admission to higher education tended to be a function not of universities but of the selective secondary schools which fed into them.

The leveling off of enrollments and hence of faculty recruitment is already adding to faculty isolation and fragmentation, and this will increase. As higher education enters a "steady state," competitiveness for students within and between institutions and for individual advancement will exacerbate. Faculty salaries and benefits relative to other professions will decline, and unionization together with various egalitarian pressures will reduce the differentials between salaries of teaching staff at different levels and in different kinds of institutions. These and other forecasts, so cogently outlined by David Robinson at Aspen, are bound to have their impacts on faculty isolation and fragmentation, on faculty morale and malaise.[26]

The problem of "steady state" is common to most of the industrialized countries where enrollment increases have

---

[25] John Vaizey, "Radical Changes in the Academic Profession," *op. cit., Higher Education and the Current Crises*, p. 139.

[26] David Z. Robinson, "Faculty in an Age of Possible Decline," *Ibid.*, pp. 151-158.

slowed down or ceased. Cambridge University, England, faces the steady state prospect, and W. H. Plommer, lecturer in classical archaeology, vividly commented on it in reacting to a report of December 1974 of the General Board (of the university) on the subject:

> In this "steady state" our size and framework are to be steady-rigid, indeed, and rigidly controlled. But inside the aquarium, bubble departments are to come into being and pass away—always with the Board's permission—pile is to chivy pike, and the small fry are to be gobbled up. Or perhaps the academic community will resemble a bowlful of meadow-pipits and young cukoos. [27]

It is not inconceivable that a fragmentation of the function of the professoriate will engender further fragmentation and isolation among the profession. Already the Open University in Britain has demonstrated that splitting up the tasks of course preparation, lecturing, the application of educational technology, tutoring, counseling, and evaluating can be relatively cheap, given a critical mass of students for a given course.[28] Another model is to be found in Spain where "contracted teachers" (untenured) are responsible for 85% of all university teaching.[29] Part-time and partial-function faculty would assure faculty fragmentation.

It would also diminish the power of the professoriate. In several respects this power has already diminished and is likely to continue to wane. Public disenchantment with higher education may have diminished professorial esteem

---

[27] W.H. Plommer, "A Comment on the Report of the General Board," *Minerva*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, Summer 1975, p. 299.

[28] Michael Drake, "The Making of D100, a View from the Social Science Faculty" in Jeremy Tunstall, ed., *The Open University Opens*, Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press, 1974, pp. 135-9.

[29] William Chislett, "New Minister Faces Rising Problems All Round," *The Times Educational Supplement*, January 2, 1976.

and influence outside the institutions. As will be discussed later, the role of academics within the institutions in decision making is likely to decrease and financial pressures and demands for accountability transfer increasing power to the administrators who preside over budgets and must respond to the growing insistence of public authorities on accountability.

In countries where the tradition of having quasi-permanent heads of departments and deans has given way to academic democratization so that these positions are now held for only limited periods, as in Australia and Canada, the resulting "amateurization" of academic administration has inevitably put more authority in the hands of the more permanent administrators and bureaucrats. S. B. Frost, until recently vice principal of administration and professional faculties at McGill University, made the following comments on this development after a sabbatical leave spent in Australia and New Zealand where he inquired into the role of administrators:

> The democratization of the academic staff has resulted in a procession of inexperienced new appointees through the departmental offices and deaneries. In administration they are amateurs; their profession is their academic practice; they know they are in administrative office only for a short while and must try desperately to keep up with their discipline. In many universities they seldom stay in office long enough to learn the ropes. The wise old bird whom the principal can rely on because he has been chairman for many years is almost extinct. . . . Inevitably the permanent non-academic team is more knowledgeable and more experienced than their rotating colleagues, and the principal learns to listen to the voice of experience.[30]

Student power, however, the clarion call for widespread and violent disruption during the 1960s, no longer poses any

[30] Frost, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

serious threat to the power of the professoriate. As mentioned, the older students coming into higher education are more concerned with their academic work, not with reform of the institutions or society. In France less than 30% of students participate in elections for student representatives on university decision-making bodies. U.S. university and college committees have difficulty in finding students to serve on them. A constitutional court decision in Germany in 1973 held that teaching staff must be in a majority in decisions on important matters, such as budget and personnel, and in a number of *Länder* laws passed after the student disruption of the 1960s giving students one third of seats on decision-making bodies have been revised to give academic staff a majority, a principle affirmed in the recently adopted federal *Hochschulrahmengesetz*.

The changes in aims, structures, and clienteles of higher education have produced a confusion about the academic role. Expanded enrollments have increased the pressure to teach and efforts to improve and evaluate teaching. In a number of countries universities have special centers or programs to help new (and old) faculty to strengthen their teaching skills, particularly in Australia, Britain, Canada, and the United States. A special program of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, SCREEM (Steering Committee on Research and Development into Education Matters) in the early 1970s provided financial support for projects focused *inter alia* on the improving of teaching and learning. However, despite this greater emphasis on teaching, pressure for scholarly output has continued and may even have increased as finding jobs in higher education becomes more competitive.

Adding to the confusion on faculty role, at least in the United States, is the fact that in the last several years faculty have been increasingly called on to supervise and assess learning experiences which deviate significantly from more traditional academic work, e.g. internships, practicums, and

other forms of "experiential learning." Whether or not the trend to encourage such learning experiences grows or is a casualty of the more conservative mood settling on higher education as a result of financial problems remains to be seen. Also, although practical experience as part of higher education may expand in other countries—it already is an integral part of certain programs in Britain, France, and Germany mainly in but not confined to engineering[31]—that faculty will be called on to assess that experience is unlikely.

Demands of the older and more vocationally or professionally oriented students and the increased emphasis on recurrent education together with the less thorough preparation of entering university students which may accompany the shift from elite to mass higher education calls for some redefinition of the role of the professoriate and confusion and uncertainty regarding its future.

### Administrators

Finally as to the administrators within and outside of higher education institutions. They have multiplied and now tend to rotate less than the academics. As decisions on higher education focus more and more on budgets, the administrators require more information, are more involved in planning, and have increased power because of their crucial intermediary role. They translate public policy decisions on higher education into formulae for the funding of research, implementing staff-student ratios at different levels and in different disciplines, student finance arrangements, and the like. Moreover, as in higher education systems the administrators are more and more working with officials in the governmental or other bodies which oversee or guide or give directions to the systems and the institutions within them, as Frost observed:

[31] Bertrand Girod de l'Ain, *L'Enseignement Supèrieur en Alternance, Actes du Colloque National de Rennes*, Paris: La Documentation Française, 1974.

> What might be described as "a fraternization of bureaucracies" has taken place. The vice-principal (finance) and his colleague, the comptroller, are necessarily in frequent communication with the finance secretary of the ministry of education; the director of planning is constantly on the phone to the capital funds section of the ministry; the personnel office is talking just as often to the minister of social security . . . . Moreover the finance officers of the different universities who obviously talk each other's language, face similar problems and stand in need of identical information, equally often talk to one another, exchange information and undoubtedly derive much profit for their universities by the development of uniform attitudes. . . . This "fraternization of bureaucracy" may be said to be taking place both vertically to the ministry and laterally to other universities.[32]

Countering this may be, however, a suspicion and lack of confidence on the part of government bureaucrats toward higher education administrators. In Bertil Östergren's view, "It seems as though central bureaucracy silently reasoned like this: officially we have to treat them as if they were bureaucrats, but we do not really believe that they are."[33]

These remarks have tried to build on the 1975 Aspen seminar discussions on students, faculty, and administrators. They present a changing outlook for faculty in particular as they adjust to the needs of new and more diverse students and to the increasing power of the higher education bureaucracies. This situation is probably inevitable, given the increased importance of higher education as an instrument of social policy. As such it can no longer, as in the past, march to its own drummer. To the implications of this for the aims and management of higher education the next essay is addressed.

---

[32] Frost, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[33] Bertil Östergren, *Planning for Change in Higher Education, A Description of Interim Reports of a Swedish Study*. Stockholm: Office of the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities, September 1975, p. 20.

# CHANGING AIMS AND MANAGEMENT

Just as the basic aims of the developed countries are being questioned, especially economic growth, so too are the aims of higher education and its growth. Leaders in higher education as in government may face the dismaying prospect of what Kenneth Boulding has called "the management of decline" and even the management of the unmanageable. James S. Coleman, in one of the background papers commended to seminar participants, analyzed the impact on the university of society's new demands upon it, and sketched what he characterized as the "emergent character of the university:"

> A shell of a former community structure that has lost the norms that supported its once central common activity of teaching and studying and is invaded by a variety of activities that thrive on the skills contained within it. This rush of new activities into the university has so changed the content of its activities and its relation to society that its function is very different from that of the classical liberal conception of the university, insulated from action in society and able to provide a detached perspective upon that action.[34]

## Recurrent Education

Among the social pressures on higher education which have significant implications for its aims and structure is the

---

[34] James S. Coleman, "The University and Society's New Demands upon It," in *Content and Context*, Carl Kaysen, ed., a Report Prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973, p. 374.

pressure for more vocationally oriented teaching. John Vaizey pointed to the "great growth of degrees in service occupations in the postindustrial society," e.g. four universities in the United Kingdom now offer degrees in hotel management.[35] Torsten Husén remarked on the increasing vocationalism in undergraduate programs in Swedish higher education, especially for the enlarging number of adult students with their more structured goals. More vocationalism, as mentioned, also seems a likely result of the expansion of recurrent education. Rapidly changing technological societies cannot foresee and provide through initial education the competences they need. The retraining of older students through recurrent education therefore becomes part of an active manpower policy which coordinates educational provision, labor market training, and adult education.

In France, recurrent education will also affect higher education offerings. Legislation of 1972 in that country which requires business firms to devote a percentage of their wage bill to diversified and expanded education programs for workers (1% in 1975 and 2% a few years hence) will fund university efforts to offer more vocationally oriented courses. Already, as Alain Bienaymé pointed out, three universities—in Aix, Strasbourg, and Toulouse—now have special departments which offer recurrent education to retired people.

The increased emphasis on recurrent education will call for more diversified curricular content in higher education. Moreover, to take account of the variety of cultural backgrounds and needs of the new students, approaches to teaching and examination will also need to be diversified. These needs in turn will entail a great deal of research on new fields and more effective efforts by the universities to make the public aware of what they can offer. However, as Bienaymé asked, will the development of more vocational programs at the universities be at the expense of basic

[35] Vaizey, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

research and nonutilitarian courses? How can objective criteria be identified to guide decisions on these matters?

More than one seminarist expressed misgivings about the aims of recurrent education. Is it a genuine strategy for expanding higher education opportunity? Or is the underlying intention to avoid expansion by postponing or "cooling out" demand in the hope that it will evaporate or at least diminish, and thereby reduce the costs (and vocationalization) of higher education? While supporting the expansion of recurrent education, the Aspen group was concerned about its financing. Because in few countries is a higher percentage of the GNP likely to be allocated to higher education, a greater commitment to recurrent education at the universities may be to the detriment of more traditional academic goals, such as offering a general or liberal education.

## Liberal Education

If higher education becomes more vocationally oriented, what are the implications for a liberal education and its continued validity? Father Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, who joined the seminar one week, asserted that a liberal education has more validity than ever. In his view a liberal education should enable a young person to situate himself in relation to the world, to know where to turn for answers, to be at ease in being a person in this world, to be more curious after graduation than before, to interiorize the values needed for life, to love beauty, and to appreciate the need for global justice.

No one could fault such a thoughtful definition. David Perkins, no token student he but another lively seminarist, spoke compellingly of the dilemmas a liberal arts college student in the United States faces in searching for a liberal education and in gaining from a college education a knowledge of what his/her goals are. He analyzed what he called the monastic view, the laissez-faire pluralism approach, and the concept of liberal education as a wheel with each discipline seeing itself at the center. The last would appear to

vitiate the notion that the concept of a liberal education can claim a consensus on aims and content. If a coherent world view is a major goal of a liberal education, it seems to be in a state of disarray. But is this to be blamed on higher education or on the state of the world, the complexities of which may defy efforts to define the coherent world view of which David Perkins spoke, but make it more urgent than ever?

**Career Training**

If the nature and place of vocational and liberal education in higher education and their implications for the aims of higher education are increasingly in question, the nature and product of professional education may be even more. In the medieval period Bologna, Salerno, Paris and Oxbridge Universities were indeed professional, training for the law, medicine, the clergy, and teaching. The emergence since then of new professions has greatly diversified the content of university teaching, especially with regard to science and engineering and most recently the whole field of human services. The notion that higher education prepares one for a particular profession has persisted, and the professional job market until recently accommodated the notion. Thus, when only 5-10% of the college or university age group were in higher education, as in Western Europe before the enormous expansion of the 1960s, professional positions were available to graduates.

No longer is this the case, neither in the developing countries (witness the thousands of unemployed and underemployed engineers in India), nor in the developed world. In Germany, for example, whereas some 70% of university graduates entered the public service (including school and university teaching) when 5% of the age group entered university a decade or more ago, now that over 20% enter higher education (15% the universities), such assured careers for this expanded number are not or will soon cease to be available. The lockstep between specialized professional training and career expectations of salary and status needs to

be broken to reduce the rigidities of the system and its human and financial costs.[36] A strategy urged by Alexander Kwapong would be to train/educate "polyvalent students," that is, to give students a broadly based education and a flexible preprofessional or semi-professional training to which more specialized training can be added at a later stage as needed.

Efforts in this direction are underway in France and Great Britain. In the former, under a reform of 1973, a new diploma awarded at the end of the first two-year cycle of university studies, the *Diplôme des Etudes: Universitaires Générales* (D.E.U.G.), has superseded more specialized diplomas and the less flexible curricula which they certified. In Britain as in other Western European countries a declining birthrate in the last decade or more portends a sharp reduction in the number of school teachers needed. There will be some 800,000 fewer 5-14 year olds in 1981 than in 1975. To adapt to this reduced need and not reduce higher education enrollments proportionately in the colleges of education (although a substantial reduction has been mandated by the Department of Education and Science along with the closing of a number of the colleges), the colleges now offer a new diploma of higher education along with the certificate of education, the latter to a reduced student intake. The two-year Dip. H.E. offers a broader education than the certificate which in principle will lead to a range of employment possibilities. Whether this in fact happens remains to be tested.

## Higher Education Planning

The various efforts to expand recurrent education, to redefine the place and nature of a liberal education, and to adapt higher education to changing needs in professional

[36] For a discussion of this problem in reference to engineer training in Germany see Hans Leussink, *Engineering Sciences in Today's World*, New York: ICED, Occasional Paper No. 16, pp. 16-18.

programs have become more urgent with the rapid expansion of higher education enrollments and costs and its importance as an instrument of social policies. These efforts also point up some of the problems of higher education planning. Neither in the socialist countries nor in the Western industrialized world are reliable indicators available on the kinds of higher education needed by how many, for what jobs, and with what time frame. As John Vaizey pointed out, "The techniques which we have for forward planning in higher education are very primitive and some are of low intellectual calibre."[37] Alexander Kwapong was partly admitting the failure of planning to predict accurately in urging that higher education, especially in the developing countries, produce polyvalent graduates. Training highly specialized persons who end up unemployed or underemployed is too expensive for the developing and developed countries alike.

The suggestion of James Perkins, seminar chairman, of what might be called polyvalent higher education systems is a possible solution to the problem and one that is being pursued in a number of countries, mainly the Anglo-Saxon. Given the expansion of higher education enrollments, the diversity of student bodies and the goals which they and society set for higher education, what is needed are systems which through their diversity can between them accommodate diverse aims, students, quality, staff, and programs. However, because diversity among institutions in a given system is often perceived as implying a hierarchy of quality, those institutions not at the head of the academic procession may seek to emulate those which are. Without a strong coordinating system which can ensure continued diversity, it can become a casualty of the drive for equality or of "academic drift" toward greater uniformity.

The preservation of diversity may also require a substantial degree of autonomy in the individual institutions and their

---

[37] John Vaizey, "Higher Education Planning," *Higher Education and the Current Crises, op. cit.*, p. 195.

commitment to exercising it vigorously, creatively, and cooperatively with the other institutions in the system. As James Perkins put it in a publication several years ago which focused on systems and their management and coordination, "Those who want academic direction to remain in academic hands have no choice, it seems to me, but to learn how to balance their desire for independence with the necessities for close collaboration with other universities."[38] This calls for competent and strong leadership by heads of colleges and universities, active and informed participation by faculty members in academic governance, and capable administrative staff.

Leadership trends relating to heads of colleges and universities are moving in different directions in the Anglo-Saxon and the continental European countries. Howard Bowen in analyzing trends in the United States emphasized the declining power of college and university presidents as a result of its being more and more shared or eroded by increasingly demanding forces from outside the institutions. He stated that:

> "... even for men of exceptional leadership, subtlety and diplomacy, the power of the presidency is patently incommensurate with the responsibilities. The question must be asked whether, in view of the radical dispersion of power, a college or university is governable in the sense of pursuing a coherent program based on the values of a true academic community and directed toward the broad social interest, or whether it has become merely a victim of conflicting forces like a ball suspended by rubber bands which are being pulled in different directions.[39]

Any attempt to examine the power of heads of universities, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, cannot, how-

---

[38] James A. Perkins, *Higher Education: From Autonomy to Systems*, New York: ICED, 1972, p. 12.

[39] Howard Bowen, "The Changing Power Structure in U.S. Higher Education," *op. cit., Higher Education and the Current Crises, pp. 167-8.*

ever, ignore the fact that much may still depend on the personality of the individuals involved. Even though, at least for the "multiversity" in the United States, "The day of the monarchs has passed,"[40] personal leadership and style still may make a difference. In reviewing *Power and Authority in British Universities* by Graeme C. Moodie and Rowland Eustace and remarking on the difference between the efficient power and formal responsibility of university vice-chancellors, K.R. Minogue wrote that:

> Much depends on personality; some are constitutional monarchs; others are exemplified by the story of A.D. Lindsay. . .: "(Once) when every vote went against (him) he smiled and said genially Well, we seem to have reached an impasse."[41]

Although in the continental European higher education institutions the power of the president or rector may also be "incommensurate with the responsibilities," this power has increased in the last few years. Various university reforms have provided for longer terms of office, for increased power at the center as the power of chairholders and heads of departments and institutes has been dispersed among students, other faculty members, and administrators. However, the power of heads of institutions cannot be measured only in terms of what they may have accrued in the process of internal democratization. It also is a factor of what they may have lost vis-à-vis the public authorities which place increasing demands upon them. Neither external bodies nor internal governance systems have given to presidents and rectors the degree of authority they need to cope effectively with demands from within and without.

Although, as Howard Bowen pointed out, active participation by faculty in academic governance increased in the last

---

[40] Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963, p. 32.

[41] K.R. Minogue, "Sober Thoughts on University Government," *Minerva*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, Summer 1975, p. 324.

20 years, at least in the United States, it seems likely to diminish in the future. The pressure of the sheer expansion of enrollments together with a decline in faculty recruitment have in a number of countries increased the teaching load of faculty, leaving them less time and zest for active participation in governance. In Britain, for example, some 500 faculty positions were unfilled as of fall 1975, an economy measure inevitably adding to the burden of existing faculty. A similar situation exists in North America and some of the other Western European countries. The slowdown in faculty recruitment is producing a teaching staff who are older, more conservative, and sometimes apathetic toward activities extending beyond their immediate concern with teaching and scholarship. Faculty unionization tends in the long run to discourage faculty initiative in university affairs as some of the major issues, e.g. teaching load, then become the responsibility of the union.

Finally, the pressures toward greater efficiency in higher education administration with all the apparatus and arcane language of cost accounting and new management techniques that these entail reenforce the academic's tendency to cultivate his/her own garden. At the University of Lancaster's second International Conference on Higher Education, Sir Eric Ashby, then Master of Clare College, commented that "There is a need . . . to include in higher education some experience which will help people to learn the art of that sort of decision making which includes scientific data, estimates of practicality, and a framework of ethical principles."[42] Although Sir Eric was mainly referring to the experience students should gain, his recommendations might also apply to faculty so that they are not discouraged from participation in university governance and administration by its increased complexity, requirements of specialized knowledge, and bureaucratization, as W.H. Plommer suggests they may be:

---

[42] Eric Ashby, *The Structure of Higher Education: A World View*, New York: ICED, Occasional Paper No. 6, 1973, p. 18.

> And blind professors summarize and peer
> And catalogue, and will not understand;
> And where the bards once spread their glittering cheer,
> An electronic surfeit stuns the cynic's ear.[43]

## Power of Administrators

The management of higher education institutions, including the preservation and exercise of their autonomy, is more and more falling to the growing ranks of administrators within the institutions. Increased demands by ministries, coordinating authorities, and/or intermediary bodies interposed between the higher education institutions and government have required an expansion in the administrative staff of the institutions. What S.B. Frost wrote with respect to Canada, Australia, and New Zealand applies to other countries as well:

> As governments have concerned themselves more and more closely with the day-to-day expenditure of the vast sums they are supplying, they have demanded new forms of budgetary control, new refinements of statistical data and a new precision of determination of staff.... The provision of capital funds was made subject to complicated formulae based on norms which required expert interpretation ... As a result universities have had to staff planning departments, personnel offices, pension, fringe benefit and health offices and many others that were quite uncalled for ten years ago. The advent of the computer and the creation and staffing of a highly technical computer center has similarly made the creation of a systems management office a prime necessity. These functions have inevitably created a whole new bureaucracy within the university.[44]

There is also a self-accelerating aspect to academic bureaucratization.[45] As central or coordinating or intermediary

---

[43] Plommer, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

[44] Frost, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.

[45] Mr. Bienaymé preferred the word technocracy to bureaucracy, the latter in his view denoting an incompetent technocracy.

bodies expand their staff in order to scrutinize and sometimes direct higher education institutions, the institutions enlarge their administrative staff to keep pace with demands placed upon them by central bodies. And as the institutions take on new functions and programs, central bodies expand their staff to keep track of these new activities. In stressing this development Torsten Husén observed that at the University of Stockholm the central administration increased from about five in 1945 to over 100 persons today, and John Vaizey referred to a dramatic increase in the staff of the University Grants Committee (U.G.C.) in Britain in the last 15 years.

## Bureaucratic Impact

The French members of the Aspen seminar expressed a strong concern about the impact of centralized decision making at the government level on higher education systems. Do individual institutions of higher education maintain more vigor, cohesiveness and initiative when instead of their being directly under a central government authority, an intermediary or buffer body is interposed between them and government, as with the U.G.C.? Are individual institutions more hesitant to assert autonomy when they are directly under government? In the case of France, Mr. Le Bris suggested that the establishment of an intermediary body would help isolate decision making on higher education from "destructive political forces and pressures." It would also contribute to higher education institutions by reviewing their programs, advising on their finance, and evaluating results.

A basic conflict between the enlargement of a central bureaucracy, whether in a governmental or intermediary body, and democratic participation in decision making was emphasized by Husén. At what point does a large central bureaucracy generate such a momentum of its own that it submerges academic democracy and the autonomy of individual institutions? Looked at from another point of view, at what point, asked Howard Bowen, does an individual institution become so absorbed in crisis decisions of the day

that it cannot reflect on and give guidance to the institution's future directions, an exercise vital to an informed exercise of autonomy? At what point do individual faculty feel so threatened or numbed by the bureaucratization of their institutions and the system that they opt out of active participation in institutional decision making? Can a university be governed efficiently and democratically? Does system coordination stultify or deter innovation, as Nell Eurich suggested? These problems are allied partly with declining growth patterns in enrollments and financial resources. They also involve the size of individual institutions.

### Size of Institution

Several of the Aspen participants asserted that faculty apathy and bureaucratization tend to set in after an institution has reached a given size. The magic number in Dietrich Goldschmidt's view is an enrollment of 10,000. David Robinson argued that it is not the total enrollment but how an institution is subdivided and its component units organized which matter, as with New York University which maintained a human scale even with an enrollment of well over 20,000. It was recalled that the Robbins Committee Report in Britain (1963) posited 7,500 as a maximum enrollment for universities. That an institution's size may have something to do with its manageability was agreed to, especially its quality as a community. However, there was no consensus at Aspen on what the maximum size should be except that Luis Garibay's suggestion that the 250,000 enrollment at the National University of Mexico undoubtedly exceeds the limit.

### Erosion of "Community"

The seminar participants all agreed that the notion of community is extremely important and were concerned for its future. The growth of higher education institutions and systems and the increased specialization within them has

caused a fragmentation of the higher education community, as have its increased complexity and diversity. In Torsten Husén's view, when because of enrollment expansion universities become "training camps," they cease to be communities of scholars. However, as Dietrich Goldschmidt emphasized, the erosion of a community sense in many universities in recent years has been the result of circumstances, not from any ill will on the part of those involved.

The diminished sense of community may also be a result of the democratization of higher education institutions. Husén observed that the notion of a community in which scholars teach and students learn from them, a notion implying an inherently hierarchical community, is undermined by decision-making systems which put students on an equal level with scholars. Governance reforms have almost nowhere legislated total equality between students and scholars on a one person, one vote basis. However, to the extent that students participate in decision making on an equal basis with faculty (although less now than a few years ago), eroding the distinction between teacher and taught, the nature of the academic community is certainly changed.

The erosion of a sense of community in higher education is also closely bound up with the question as to whether the university is a separate community in itself apart from society or is part of and actively participates in society. If higher education is now so much an agency or instrument of social policy that it is inextricably linked with society, the notion of a community of scholars separated from society no longer has validity. Certainly, higher education has already moved far in this direction. Raymond-François Le Bris remarked that the dichotomy between higher education and society in France has become blurred. A university today is not a community of scholars but a community of society. Many scholars are integrated into society, and so many students now combine work and academic study that the student is no longer separate from society.

Everywhere the worlds of work and of higher education

increasingly intersect and overlap. This appears characteristic of higher education systems as they move from elite to mass, as they admit older and employed persons as students, and as they become more expensive, more dependent upon public funding, and more integral to social policy. What Miriam Camps has referred to in the field of international relations as the Management of Interdependence[46] is an issue in higher education as institutions and systems are more and more impelled to devise policies and procedures for the management of their interdependence with society.

[46] Miriam Camps, *Management of Interdependence: A Preliminary View*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1974. (Council Papers on International Affairs).

# WHICH DRUMMER?

Higher education no longer marches to its own drummer, if indeed it ever did. Warren Bennis, president of the University of Cincinnati, has commented that "The university is, in a sense, an anvil on which the hammer of a fragmented society pounds away. The anvil chorus is a dissonance, not a harmony."[47]

**Pressures on the University**

The pressures on the university are many and not all compatible. There are pressures to respond to different clienteles and different needs, local or regional, national, and international. In some countries new higher education institutions have been established to complement the universities because the latter either resist pressures to provide new kinds of educational programs or because it is considered inappropriate for them to do so.

These programs tend to be for technical, business, and commercial training with a practical or applied orientation. They respond to the relatively recent vocational and professional education needs mentioned earlier. Part of the rationale for some of these new programs and institutions lies also in the concept that they should be responsive to local or regional needs. And it is partly as a result of this that there is a continuing debate over whether these newer institutions are "separate but equal" to the universities, and whether they cater to different kinds of student interests or mainly serve students aspiring to university who fail to gain admission to

[47] Warren Bennis, "Managing the Unmanageable," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 22, 1975, p. 20.

them.[48] Nevertheless, a common characteristic of these new institutions is a concern with their immediate community and region.

The colleges of applied arts and technology (CAATS) established in Ontario in 1966 and the community colleges in other Canadian provinces have deliberately attempted to adapt to local and community needs, especially in the students they serve and the programs they offer. In Australia the focus of the 78 colleges of advanced education (CAEs) which enroll about 45% of tertiary education students is allegedly more on applied and technical programs and on meeting manpower needs of national development than on local and regional needs as such, although these are certainly important to the CAEs. Community needs would have priority in Australia's proposed National Institute of Open Tertiary Education as among its functions would be "to arrange surveys of needs of the community generally and of special clienteles for degree and diploma programmes and for continuing vocational and non-vocational education of tertiary level, and to identify gaps in present offerings."[49] In France the *Instituts Universitaires de Technologie* have a community concern in trying to respond to the trained manpower needs of the regions where they are located.

**Regionalization and Higher Education**

Sweden appears to be carrying the localization or regionalization of higher education farther than most other countries. Present plans aim at regionalizing higher education with the establishment of new boards of universities and colleges. The country will be divided into six higher education regions with university cities as their headquarters, each with a regional

---

[48] For a discussion of this in Britain and Australia see David H. Ham, "Duality in Higher Education: Are There Two Systems?" *The Australian University*, Vol. 13, No. 1, May 1975, pp. 19-34.

[49] *Open Tertiary Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

board which will have a majority of membership from outside the institutions of higher education. The regional boards will "coordinate planning of undergraduate and professional/vocational education."[50] They will be concerned with coordinating and planning undergraduate and professional education in their region, maintaining links between teaching and research, and with the development of new curricula and of recurrent education programs.

The OECD sponsored a meeting in Grenoble, France, in 1971 on what it called short-cycle institutions (SCI), nonuniversity institutions which typically have a shorter study period than universities, the main exception being the British polytechnics. Although, except for community colleges in the United States, SCIs were then relatively new and their functions and relationship to university education were in most countries still being worked out, it was emphasized at Grenoble that "SCIs, as all higher education establishments, have an important role to play as agents or poles of regional development."[51] Elements of this were seen to include training qualified manpower for the region, creating employment opportunities, and attracting new industry as a result of producing qualified manpower. The report of the Grenoble meeting stated that the establishment of SCIs "is or should be an important element in the whole conception of comprehensive regional planning (*l'aménagement du territoire*)."[52]

The distinction between regionally oriented nonuniversity institutions and the universities has seemed to blur in the last several years. In some countries the nonuniversity institutions have expanded their academic programs to include the general or liberal studies more commonly associated with universities, e.g. in Australian CAEs and British polytechnics.

---

[50] Östergren, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

[51] OECD, *Short-Cycle Higher Education, A Search for Identity*, Paris: 1973, p. 35.

[52] *Ibid*, p. 35.

Universities, on the other hand, are developing more links with their surrounding communities. The French universities, for example, since the 1968 Orientation Law, include in their university councils "public personalities"—people from industry, commerce, labor, and other locally based enterprises and interest groups. Moreover, proposals in 1975 to regionalize the universities by setting up seven academic regions with about ten universities in each were aimed in part at forging closer links between the universities and local commerce and industry.

Some of the British universities are also building more links outside their walls, especially with local industry, as with the University of Manchester's Research Consultancy Service which "assists industry, commercial companies and local authorities to establish relevant contacts within the University."[53] In the United States, according to Nell Eurich, private as well as public colleges and universities are similarly demonstrating a greater concern for the needs of their communities and attempting to respond to them with special academic programs and other outreach efforts.

Seminar participants mostly applauded this trend. However, it was recognized that there is a considerable difference between regionalization in the sense of an individual college or university's attempting to identify and respond to needs in its region, and a regional higher education policy providing for substantial involvement by local interests and authorities in decisions on access, curriculum, and research, and for coordination of higher education institutions in a region to ensure that the total system contributes to its development. The first and more limited regional involvement implies no necessary limits on autonomy. The second and more encompassing version of regionalization may encourage more institutional autonomy if it is part of a process of decentralization in a centralized system, as proposed in France.

---

[53] International Association of Universities, *Bulletin*, Vol. XXIII No. 3, 1975, Paris: International Bureau of the Universities, p. 189.

Conversely, it may limit autonomy if it means moving toward a regionally coordinated higher education system in a situation where no coordination had existed. In either case, as Luis Garibay emphasized, autonomy carries with it responsibility, and institutions should be concerned about their surrounding society. Whether or not this calls for the participation of regional interests in decisions on internal academic policies is controversial.

## "National" Universities

While agreeing that higher education institutions should have this concern, some, more than others of the seminar participants, were strongly of the view that every country should have universities that are national, not regional or local only. But is a "national university" an instrument of national policy "in the nation's service," or should it have a truly universal character? Clearly, it is not necessarily the national universities but national systems of higher education which should respond to the problems raised by Edward Heath when he pointed out to a student group at Edinburgh in December 1975 that only "one in four of new graduates go into industry and less than one in 10 enter commerce."[54]

## Research Needs

The distinction between specific training and research needs and more universal—less parochial functions—also applies at the international level. Alexander Kwapong of the United Nations University outlined some of the objectives of that new institution. It will give priority to a series of international problems: "World hunger; the management and use of natural resources; human and social development."[55] These

---

[54] "Inert... Our Enemy, Change Our Ally, *The Times Educational Supplement*, December 19, 1975, p. 6.

[55] *The United Nations University, Present Status*, Summer/Fall 1975; brochure of the university, Tokyo, 1975.

are indeed pressing world problems and the Aspen seminar participants agreed to their urgency. But the issue is not so much the urgency of what a given institution concentrates upon but who decides what the issues shall be.

In this connection considerable concern was expressed for the future of the "national" or international university and its focus on research which was generally agreed is essential to it. Will the democratization of access and the multiplication of social demands at national centers of excellence as at other institutions drive out research? Dietrich Goldschmidt voiced doubts that it would be in the long-run interest of research to seek refuge in research institutes outside the higher education system as it might end up less independent than if it remained with the universities, even though subject to enlarging societal pressures–and financial stringency. According to Vaizey, the most creative research occurs when several disciplines interface, a situation much more apt to happen in universities than in specialized research institutes. How much longer is such research possible at the universities, given encroaching societal pressures?

## Conclusion

"To which drummer" was indeed a recurring theme in the seminar. Given the diverse and international composition of the group, reactions varied but only in degree. The firm consensus was that at least some universities should stand apart from society rather than being a part of it, in the sense of responding to regional, national or even international needs if they were determined from without. The "monitoring" function of higher education has been defined by George Brosan, director of North East London Polytechnic, as enabling a university "by virtue of its independence to consider all activities and comment on them freely. That is, it operates as a critic or contemplator of society."[56] He



[56] Ham, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

contrasted this with training manpower and causing knowledge to be applied.

As with so many other imponderables which the seminar confronted, the definition of this critical function eluded precise definition. However, as Vaizey said, the university remains one of the few radical institutions in society in the sense of trying to get to the root of matters. Moreover, in the face of the many societal pressures mentioned earlier, the critical function is increasingly difficult to carry out—although perhaps easier to justify because it is more difficult and more needed. The value of this critical function by higher education institutions and the people who frequent them was affirmed by the Aspen seminar. Basically it was a coming together of higher education experts and practitioners from countries facing comparable circumstances to reflect on common problems, and to ponder future directions. The Aspen environment was conducive to such an exercise. The community of interest and experience which typified the seminar's discussions and conclusions amply validated the enterprise.

**International Council for Educational Development**

The International Council for Educational Development (ICED) is an international non-profit association of persons with a common concern for the future of education and its role in social and economic development.

ICED's major interests are strategies of education for development and the modernization and management of systems of higher education. In each area, ICED's purposes are to identify and analyze major educational problems shared by a number of countries, to generate policy recommendations, and to provide consultation, on request, to international and national organizations.

ICED's activities are directed by James A. Perkins, chief executive officer and chairman of an international board. Philip H. Coombs is vice chairman. The headquarters office is in New York City.

The main support for ICED to date has come from the Ford Foundation, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, UNICEF, the Clark Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Krupp Foundation, the Volkswagen Foundation, and the Charles E. Merrill Trust. Twelve national and international agencies supported ICED's 18-month study on Higher Education for Development.

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

James A. Perkins
Chairman of the Board

Philip H. Coombs
Vice Chairman of the Board

Lord Ashby
Master of Clare College (retired)
Cambridge, England

Ernest L. Boyer
Chancellor
State University of New York
Albany, New York

Harlan Cleveland
Director
Aspen Program in
International Affairs
Princeton, New Jersey

Ricardo Díez Hochleitner
Director
Education and International
Programs
Fundación General Mediterránea
Madrid, Spain

Alvin C. Eurich
President
Academy for Educational
Development
New York, New York

Felipe Herrera
Coordinator General
ECIEL Program
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

James M. Hester
Rector
United Nations University
Tokyo, Japan

Torsten Husén
Professor of Education and
Director of the Institute for
the Study of International
Problems in Education
University of Stockholm
Stockholm, Sweden

Lady Barbara Ward Jackson
President
International Institute for
Environment and
Development
London, England

Henri Janne
President
Collège Scientifique
'nstitut de Sociologie
Université Libre de Bruxelles
Brussels, Belgium

Clark Kerr
Chairman
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies
in Higher Education
Berkeley, California

Max Kohnstamm
President
European University Institute
Florence, Italy

Peter F. Krogh
Dean
School of Foreign Service
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Alexander A. Kwapong
Vice Rector
United Nations University
Tokyo, Japan

Raymond-François Le Bris
Le Directeur du Cabinet
Secrétariat d'Etat aux Universités
Paris, France

Hans Leussink
Former Federal Minister of
Education and Science
Karlsruhe, West Germany

Sol M. Linowitz, Esq.
Coudert Brothers
Washington, D.C.

Edwin M. Martin
Chairman
Consultative Group on Food
Production and Investment
in Developing Countries
Washington, D.C.

Robert S. McNamara
President
International Bank for
Reconstruction and
Development
Washington, D.C.

Martin Meyerson
President
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Michio Nagai
Minister of Education
Tokyo, Japan

Alfonso Ocampo Londoño
President
Compañia Promotora
Papelera Ltda.
Cali, Colombia

Paola Coppola Pignatelli
Professor of Architectural
Design
Gruppo di Ricerche
sull'Edilizia per
l'Istruzione Superiore
University of Rome
Rome, Italy

Joseph E. Slater
President
Aspen Institute for
Humanistic Studies
New York, New York

Jan Szczepanski
Director
Instytut Filozofii
Polska Akademia Nauk
Warsaw, Poland

Puey Ungphakorn
Rector
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand